

Spurious diffusion in particle simulations of the Kolmogorov flow

M. Malek Mansour ^a, C. Van den Broeck ^b, I. Bena ^b, and F. Baras ^a

(a) Centre for Nonlinear Phenomena and Complex Systems

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Campus Plaine, C.P. 231

B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

(b) Limburgs Universitair Centrum

B-3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium

(February 1, 2008)

05.40+j, 05.90+m, 47.11+j, 47.20Ky

Abstract

Particle simulations of the Kolmogorov flow are analyzed by the Landau-Lifshitz fluctuating hydrodynamics. It is shown that a spurious diffusion of the center of mass corrupts the statistical properties of the flow. The analytical expression for the corresponding diffusion coefficient is derived.

Some fifty years ago, Kolmogorov introduced a simple hydrodynamic model, that displays various instabilities, including a transition to turbulence [1]. The richness of this model, known as the Kolmogorov flow, combined with its simplicity, has attracted a great number of both theoretical and numerical work [2–5]. In particular, particle simulations, based on Lattice Boltzmann [6] or Lattice gas automata [7], have been used to study the statistical properties of the flow in high Reynolds number regime [5,8–10]. The purpose of this letter is to point out a subtle problem concerning the nonequilibrium fluctuations that appear in this model. We show that the center of mass of the system undergoes a spurious diffusion that corrupts the statistical properties of the flow.

The Kolmogorov flow is an isothermal fluid confined in a rectangular box $L_x \times L_y$, $\{0 \leq x < L_x, 0 \leq y < L_y\}$, with periodic boundary conditions in both directions. The flow is maintained through an external force field of the form

$$\mathbf{F}_{ext} = F_0 \sin(2\pi n y/L_y) \mathbf{1}_x, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_x$ is the unit vector in the x direction. The relevant parameters are the strength of the force field F_0 , the wave number n of the forcing, and the aspect ratio $a_r = L_x/L_y$.

For small enough F_0 , the flow follows basically the external field and the stationary velocity profile is readily found to be

$$\mathbf{v}_{st} = u_0 \sin(2\pi n y/L_y) \mathbf{1}_x, \quad (2)$$

$$u_0 \equiv \frac{F_0 L_y^2}{4\pi^2 n^2 \eta} \quad (3)$$

where η is the shear viscosity coefficient. However, upon increasing F_0 , this stationary state becomes unstable giving rise to rotating convective patterns [2,3]. Other instabilities of increasing complexity appear for larger values of F_0 , culminating in a turbulent - like behavior [4,5].

To study the statistical properties of this system, we turn to a description in terms of the fluctuating hydrodynamic equations:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{v})}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}) - \nabla P - \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \mathbf{F}_{ext}, \quad (5)$$

where ρ is the mass density, P the hydrostatic pressure and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ the *two-dimensional* stress tensor:

$$\sigma_{i,j} = -\eta \left(\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i} - \delta_{i,j} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) - \zeta \delta_{i,j} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} + S_{i,j}. \quad (6)$$

$\mathbf{S}$ is a random tensor whose elements $\{S_{i,j}\}$ are Gaussian white noises with zero mean and covariances given by [11]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_{i,j}(\mathbf{r}, t) S_{k,\ell}(\mathbf{r}', t') \rangle &= 2k_B T_0 \delta(t - t') \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \\ &\quad \left[\eta (\delta_{i,k}^{Kr} \delta_{j,\ell}^{Kr} + \delta_{i,\ell}^{Kr} \delta_{j,k}^{Kr}) + (\zeta - \eta) \delta_{i,j}^{Kr} \delta_{k,\ell}^{Kr} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where k_B and T_0 stand for the Boltzmann constant and the (uniform) temperature, respectively. For simplicity, we shall assume that the shear and bulk viscosity coefficients, η and ζ , are state independent, i.e., they are constant.

When imposing a force field, one has to keep in mind that both in microscopic simulations and in real systems, the fluid is made out of individual particles. Hence one cannot impose a bulk force, but rather an acceleration field acting on the particles. Since the density of particles is fluctuating, we conclude that the external field in the momentum equation (5) is also a fluctuating quantity:

$$\mathbf{F}_{ext} = \rho(x, y) a_0 \sin(2\pi n y / L_y) \mathbf{1}_x, \quad (8)$$

where a_0 is the amplitude of the imposed acceleration field. Furthermore, since the external field in the Kolmogorov flow is space-dependent, the force acting on a particle depends on its *exact* position so that the total force (in the x -direction) $F(t)$ will also be fluctuating, even though the total number of particles is conserved. As a result, the center of mass linear momentum, denoted by $J_x(t)$, undergoes a stochastic motion driven by a scalar force $F(t)$:

$$\frac{\partial J_x(t)}{\partial t} = \frac{a_0}{L_x L_y} \int_0^{L_x} dx \int_0^{L_y} dy \rho(x, y, t) \sin(2\pi n y / L_y) \equiv F(t). \quad (9)$$

In strictly subsonic regimes the flow behaves essentially as an incompressible fluid so that the average density is uniform in space, $\langle \rho \rangle = \rho_0$. It then follows from eq. (9) that $\langle F(t) \rangle = 0$. To find the force correlation function $\langle F(t)F(t') \rangle$, we consider the spatial average of the hydrodynamical equations (4, 5) over the x direction and notice that corresponding spatially averaged density, $\rho(y, t) = \frac{1}{L_x} \int_0^{L_x} dx \rho(x, y, t)$, and y component of the velocity, $v(y, t) = \frac{1}{L_x} \int_0^{L_x} dx v_y(x, y, t)$, are not affected by the external constraints, i.e. they assume their equilibrium form. In particular, in the *stationary regime* one has that $\langle \rho \rangle = \rho_0$ and $\langle v \rangle = 0$ are independent of the value of a_0 . To study the fluctuations around this state, we introduce the deviations $\delta\rho(y, t) = \rho(y, t) - \rho_0$, $\delta v(y, t) = v(y, t)$ and $\delta P(y, t) = P(y, t) - \langle P \rangle$, that obey the following linearized equations :

$$\frac{\partial \delta\rho}{\partial t} = -\rho_0 \frac{\partial \delta v}{\partial y} \quad (10)$$

$$\rho_0 \frac{\partial \delta v}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial y} + (\eta + \zeta) \frac{\partial^2 \delta v}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\partial S_{yy}}{\partial y} \quad (11)$$

with

$$\langle S_{yy}(y, t) S_{yy}(y', t') \rangle = 2 \frac{k_B T_0}{L_x} (\eta + \zeta) \delta(t - t') \delta(y - y') \quad (12)$$

To close these equations, we need to specify the equation of state. Since the fluid is isothermal, we simply set

$$\delta P = c_s^2 \delta\rho, \quad (13)$$

where c_s is the isothermal sound speed.

The stochastic differential evolution equation for the fluctuating force $F(t)$ now follows easily by multiplication of (10) and (11) by $\sin(2\pi n y/L_y)$ and $\cos(2\pi n y/L_y)$, respectively, followed by integration over y . One obtains:

$$\frac{d^2 F(t)}{dt^2} + \frac{\eta + \zeta}{\rho_0} \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{L_y^2} \frac{dF(t)}{dt} + \frac{4\pi^2 n^2 c_s^2}{L_y^2} F(t) = \psi(t), \quad (14)$$

where $\psi(t)$ is a white Gaussian noise, with zero mean and variance given by:

$$\langle \psi(t) \psi(t') \rangle = \frac{k_B T_0}{L_x L_y} (\eta + \zeta) a_0^2 \left(\frac{2\pi n}{L_y} \right)^4 \delta(t - t'). \quad (15)$$

We conclude that $F(t)$ is a Gaussian non-Markovian process. The exact form of the force correlation is easily obtained from (14) and (15), but the final expression is rather lengthy. On the other hand, the validity of hydrodynamics can only be guaranteed if the parameter

$$\epsilon = \frac{\eta + \zeta}{\rho_0 c_s L_y} \quad (16)$$

remains small [12]. Accordingly, to dominant order in ϵ , the force correlation reads:

$$\langle F(t) F(0) \rangle = \rho_0^2 a_0^2 \frac{k_B T_0}{2m N c_s^2} \exp\left\{-4\pi^2 n^2 \Gamma_s t / L_y^2\right\} \cos(2\pi n c_s t / L_y) \quad ; \quad t \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

where $\Gamma_s = (\eta + \zeta)/2\rho_0$ represents the (two dimensional) sound damping coefficient, N is the total number of particles and m their individual mass.

Turning to $J_x(t)$, which is nothing but the time integral of $F(t)$, we conclude that it is a Gaussian stochastic process with zero average and second moment (again to dominant order in ϵ):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_x^2(t) \rangle &= \rho_0^2 a_0^2 \frac{k_B T_0}{m N c_s^4} \left(\Gamma_s t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2\pi n / L_y)^{-2} \left[1 - \exp(-4\pi^2 n^2 \Gamma_s t / L_y^2) \cos(2\pi n c_s t / L_y) \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

As announced, $J_x(t)$ diffuses in time (in the momentum space) with a long-time diffusion coefficient given by:

$$D = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle J_x^2(t) \rangle}{t} = \rho_0^2 a_0^2 \frac{k_B T_0}{m N c_s^4} \Gamma_s. \quad (19)$$

It is important to notice that in real macroscopic systems the very existence of the center of mass diffusion remains questionable for the following reason. Periodic boundary conditions are one of the basic simplifying features of the Kolmogorov flow. This is fine for the representation of a system of infinite extend, consisting of periodically repeated Kolmogorov units, as long as only macroscopic properties are at stake. However, when the fluctuations are under investigation, one has to realize that the periodic boundary conditions imply a perfect correlation of the fluctuating forces in the different units. This is obviously unphysical (except for the academic situation of a system defined on a torus). In any case, the diffusion coefficient D is negligibly small in macroscopic systems (typically of the order of $10^{-38} kg^2/m^2 s^3$) and is essentially unobservable.

The situation is entirely different in microscopic simulations where the total number of particles N barely exceeds 10^5 . To estimate the importance of the center of mass diffusion, and the corresponding contamination of statistical properties of the system in numerical simulations, we first note that the ratio $k_B T_0/m c_s^2$ is of the order of unity. We next observe that there is a minimum run time for simulations, namely the hydrodynamic relaxation time $\tau_h \approx L_x L_y / \Gamma_s$. Typical running times are several such τ_h . It then follows from eq. (18) that for large t (i.e. $t > \tau_h$) the center of mass velocity fluctuation, $\langle J_x^2 \rangle / \rho_0^2$, is about:

$$\langle v_x^2(t) \rangle = \frac{\langle J_x^2(t) \rangle}{\rho_0^2} \approx \frac{a_0^2}{n_0 c_s^2} \frac{t}{\tau_h}, \quad (20)$$

where $n_0 = N/L_x L_y$ is the number density. This quantity has to be compared with the spatial average of the mean square flow velocity $\bar{u}_m^2$, which is of the order of $u_0^2/2$ (see eq. (3)). The relative importance of the center of mass diffusion can thus be estimated by the square root of the ratio $\langle v_x^2(t) \rangle / \bar{u}_m^2$, hereafter denoted by $\mu(t)$. Using the explicit form of u_0 , eq. (3), one finds that for $t > \tau_h$,

$$\mu(t) = (\langle v_x^2(t) \rangle / \bar{u}_m^2)^{1/2} \approx (2/n_0)^{1/2} a_r \frac{4\pi^2 n^2 \eta}{m N c_s} (t/\tau_h)^{1/2} \quad (21)$$

where $a_r = L_x/L_y$ is the aspect ratio.

As a first example, we consider a two dimensional Boltzmann gas for which there exists an efficient algorithm, proposed two decades ago by Bird, that is about 3 orders of magnitude

faster than the corresponding traditional molecular dynamic simulation [13]. A typical case is a system involving 20 000 hard disks of diameter d , with $L_x \times L_y = 2000 \times 1000 d^2$ (i.e. $a_r = 2$ and $n_0 = 10^{-2}$ particles per d^2), $n = 2$, $c_s \approx 1$ and $\eta \approx 0.3$ (in system units, where lengths, masses and velocities are scaled by the disk diameter d , the particle mass m and the thermal velocity, $\sqrt{k_B T_0/m}$, respectively). It then follows from eq. (21) that after only one relaxation time, $\mu(\tau_h) \approx 7 \times 10^{-2}$ which is certainly not negligible, all the more so since typical running times are 10 to 100 times larger than τ_h .

One way to avoid this problem is to increase the number of particles, while keeping the number density $n_0 = 10^{-2}$ particles per d^2 , since then the Bird algorithm is applicable. However, to reach reasonably small values of μ , like for instance $\mu(\tau_h) \approx 10^{-4}$, one has to consider simulations involving over 13 millions of particles. Such simulations require a prohibitively long running time with present day computers.

The only other alternative is to increase the number density as well. For a given number of particles, the best strategy is to choose n_0 so that the Reynolds number is as high as possible, since this is precisely one of the main objectives of numerical simulations [14]. In the case of subsonic hard disk flows, the appropriate number density turns out to be about $n_0 = 0.27$ particles per d^2 [15]. For a system containing half a million of particles, $L_x \times L_y = 960 \times 1920 d^2$, $c_s \approx 1.6$ and $\eta \approx 0.4$. The function $\mu(\tau_h)$ is then about 4×10^{-4} , which is quite satisfactory. However, a number density of $n_0 \approx 0.27$ corresponds to a moderately dense Enskog gas for which the Bird algorithm is no longer applicable [16]. Instead, one has to use the traditional hard disk molecular dynamics method which, as mentioned before, is about 3 orders of magnitude slower than the corresponding dilute gas simulation. Furthermore, the collision frequency grows linearly with the number density, which further increases the running time by at least another order of magnitude. Under these conditions, pursuing the simulation for a single relaxation time τ_h is about the best one can achieve with present day computer performances. Although such a relatively short simulation might be satisfactory to study the average properties of the system, it is certainly not enough to extract the associated fluctuation spectrum.

The above discussion highlights the usefulness of lattice-particle simulations for the study of the relatively high Reynolds number flows. But these model simulations have their own limitations. Because the motion of particles takes place within a restricted geometry (4 or 6 linear directions), with the corresponding restricted number of velocities, reaching local equilibrium requires now many more collisions than in the case of hard disk dynamics [17]. As far as macroscopic properties of the system are concerned, this is only a minor problem, since lattice-particle simulations typically run seven orders of magnitude faster than hard disk molecular dynamics. The major drawback however is that such a long time simulation inevitably increases the effect of the center of mass diffusion reported here. In fact, the spurious diffusion has been noticed very recently by Boon et al. [18] in a study of the so-called "turbulent diffusion" in Kolmogorov flow.

In conclusion, while spurious diffusion of the center of mass in the Kolmogorov flow does not affect the average macroscopic behavior of the system, it does corrupt the other statistical properties, and to a significant degree under conditions that are typical for many microscopic simulations. The best way to avoid this problem is to include in the simulation algorithm an ad-hoc mechanism that prevents the center of mass momentum fluctuations. This can be accomplished rather easily in lattice-particle simulations [19], but its counterpart in molecular dynamic simulations is less obvious.

I. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank G. Nicolis and J. W. Turner for stimulating discussions. We acknowledge support from the IUAP, Prime Minister's Office of the Belgian Government, and one of us (CVdB) also from the FWO Vlaanderen. This work has been partly supported by the European Commission DG 12 (Advanced Research Meetings and Studies).

REFERENCES

- [1] A.M. Obukhov, Russ. Math. Survey **38**,113 (1983).
- [2] L. Meshalkin, and Ya.G. Sinai, J.Appl.Math.Mech. **25**, 1140 (1961) ; J.S.A. Green, J.Fluid Mech. **62**, 273 (1974).
- [3] A. A. Nepomniaschichii, J. Appl. Math. Mech. **40**, 836 (1976).
- [4] E. N. Lorenz, J. Fluid Mech., **55**, 545 (1972).
- [5] Z. S. She, Phys. Lett. A **124**, 161 (1987) ; ibid. Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. Paris VII (1987) ; G. I. Sivashinsky, Physica D **17**, 243 (1985).
- [6] R. Benzi, S. Succi and M. Vergassola, Phys. Reo. **222**, 147 (1992).
- [7] U. Frisch, B. Hasslacher and Y. Pomeau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1505 (1986) ; G. Doolen, Ed., *Lattice Gas Methods for PDE's*, Physica D **47**, 1 (1991).
- [8] M. Hénon and H. Scholl, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 5365 (1991).
- [9] R. Benzi, S. Succi, J. Stat. Phys. **56**, 69 (1989) ; U. Frisch, B. Legras, B. Villone, Physica D **94**, 36 (1996).
- [10] E. Vanden Eijnden, D. Hanon and J. P. Boon, in *Advances in Turbulence*, U. Frisch, ed., **VII**, 183 (1998).
- [11] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1984).
- [12] See for instance W. E. Alley and B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. A **27**, 3158 (1983) ; W. E. Alley, B. J. Alder and S. Yip, Phys. Rev. A **27**, 3174 (1983).
- [13] G. A. Bird, *Molecular Gas Dynamics*, Clarendon, Oxford (1976) ; ibid *Gas Dynamics and the Direct Simulation of Gas Flows*, Clarendon, Oxford (1994).
- [14] A Bird algorithm with adjustable transport coefficients has been proposed in : F. Baras, M. Malek Mansour. A. Garcia and M. Mareschal, J. Comp. Phys. **119**, 94 (1994).

- [15] A. Puhl, M. Malek Mansour and M. Mareschal, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1999 (1989).
- [16] An extension of the Bird algorithm dealing with dense systems has been reported in :
F. Alexander, A. Garcia and B. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** 5212 (1995).
- [17] D. H. Rothman and S. Zaleski, *Lattice-Gas Cellular Automata*, Cambridge University Press (1997).
- [18] J.P. Boon, E. Vanden Eijnden and D. Hanon (to appear in *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*).
- [19] D. Hanon (private communication).